



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ceased, and brothers began to exchange their sisters for brides. In brief, this is the theory of J. J. Atkinson of the origin of marriage and endogamy—a theory as novel as it is interesting.

J. E. HAGERTY.

University of Ohio.

Early Political Machinery in the United States. By GEORGE D. LUETSCHER, Ph. D. Pp. 160. Price, \$1.00. Published by the author, George School, Pa., 1903.

Although popular interest in our nominating systems has greatly increased in recent years, comparatively little aside from propaganda literature has appeared on the subject. Dahlinger's standard work and that of Dr. Meyer in advocacy of direct primaries are the principal important exceptions. Dr. Luetscher's monograph, although entitled "Political Machinery," in reality deals primarily with the methods of nomination practiced up to 1825. He shows that the nationalizing of parties during Washington's second administration marked the beginning of a revolution in the methods of nomination and political campaigning. "Before this time," he says, "politics and office-holding were confined to the 'well-born,' who constituted the enlightened minority, and, as a consequence, the greatest apathy and indifference prevailed among the individual electors regarding the selection of candidates to office and the exercise of suffrage. . . . The nation was, therefore, inexperienced in democratic organization, when the administrative measures of Hamilton supplied a permanent issue upon which the people took sides." The Republicans being the newer party and having to make the most strenuous efforts for popular favor were naturally the first to adopt new methods. Nearly all the leading newspapers were Federal in sympathy. The wealth of the country and such advantage as came from political patronage at the time were favorable to the older party. Necessarily, therefore, the Republicans devoted their attention to a distinctly popular method of nominating candidates. At first the mass-meeting was the principal method adopted, but as larger numbers of the people were appealed to a more representative form of party organization had to be evolved, and the convention system came into existence. By the nature of the case the New England and Southern States were backward in adopting this new plan. In New England the town candidates were chosen in mass-meeting of the town; the state candidates were chosen by the general legislative caucus, as throughout the rest of the country. In addition to this the New England Federal leaders were opposed to any extensive party organization in peaceful times. They regarded the formation of party committees, conventions, and such machinery, as an emergency measure which might well be adapted to the vicissitudes of a revolution, but hardly permissible after the emergency had passed. In the Southern States the aristocratic cast of politics had led to traditions which forbade any extensive popular agitation. The leaders of thought largely dictated nominations. It was, therefore, in the Middle States, where popular election of county officers had become the tradition, that a county convention was first developed. Such was the efficiency of the early county convention in enlist-

ing the interest of the people that it spread rapidly throughout the more important Middle States and resulted in the permanent defeat of the Federal party in the Middle States by 1802, except in the State of Delaware, where the Federalists adopted the convention system and thereby maintained their hold on the people. It is Dr. Luetscher's aim to show that the combat between the Federal and Republican parties was more than a conflict of ideas and measures,—it was a difference in political machinery. Had the Federalists accepted Hamilton's suggestion and adopted a thorough-going popular propaganda for their principles, the author implies that they might have held the attention and support of the people as against the opposition. This standpoint differs from the conventional and accepted view regarding the two parties. Emphasis has heretofore been placed almost exclusively upon the party programs of the time and on the traditional, aristocratic leanings of the Federalists. The author does not deny the importance of these factors, but points out that the absence of proper machinery, or rather the unwillingness of the Federal leaders to make use of the perfectly proper methods adopted by their rivals, placed the former in a position of complete helplessness. This weakness of a party, whose leaders had been strongly entrenched in nation, state and city can, by no means, be fully accounted for solely on the ground of a radical change in the ideas of the people.

In the course of his argument the author gives a very interesting discussion of the early limitations on suffrage in the Middle States and has been at considerable pains to collect from the various state archives and from the early files of newspapers a number of conclusions regarding the proportion of the voters to the total population of several of the states. In dwelling upon the mechanism of parties, Dr. Luetscher has necessarily ignored to some extent the conflict of principles during the period treated, but this is incident to any special treatment of a single phase of political growth and the monograph will be found quite helpful in correcting the existing views on our early political parties.

JAMES T. YOUNG.

University of Pennsylvania.

A History of Modern Europe. By MERRICK WHITCOMB, Ph. D. Pp. 360. Price, \$1.10. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1903.

This volume on the history of modern Europe is one of the Twentieth Century Text-books Series, in which the field of general European history is treated in two volumes, the one on the mediæval period by Professor Munro, the other on the modern period by Professor Whitcomb. Together the two volumes furnish an adequate text for European history from the time of Charles the Great to the present, though they may be satisfactorily used independently of each other. Like its counterpart, the present volume is highly successful in clear and accurate presentation of the subject; the value of the deeper insight into the history of the period which only the specialist's training can give, appears constantly. The style is much above the level of text-book writing. Unfortunately the effect of this is too often sacrificed by the great frequency with which the mechanical devices for teaching are allowed to